



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

SEAN FLYNN, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
-against-
McGRAW HILL LLC,
Defendant.

21-CV-614 (LGS) (BCM)

DAVID MYERS, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
-against-
McGRAW HILL EDUCATION, INC.,
Defendant.

21-CV-1141 (LGS) (BCM)

SEALING ORDER

BARBARA MOSES, United States Magistrate Judge.

On October 1, 2021, when filing a discovery letter-motion addressed to Judge Moses (Dkt. No. 63), plaintiffs filed Exhibits 1, 2, and 3 thereto under temporary seal (Dkt. Nos. 63-1, 63-2, and 63-3) and redacted portions of the letter-motion itself referring to those exhibits.¹ Separately, plaintiffs filed a letter-motion formally requesting that the exhibits, and the unredacted version of the discovery letter-motion, remain under seal (Dkt. No. 61), explaining that they were doing so prophylactically because the exhibits were designated "confidential" or "highly confidential" by defendants during discovery.²

In their responding letter dated October 6, 2021 (Dkt. No. 65), defendants request only that Exhibit 3 be filed in redacted form (in order to protect personally identifiable information). Defendants do not request that Exhibits 1 and 2 remain under seal, nor that the letter-motion itself remain redacted. The Court agrees that the limited redactions requested to Exhibit 3 are

¹ All docket numbers refer to the electronic docket in Case No. 21-CV-614 unless otherwise specified.

appropriate. Consequently, it is hereby ORDERED that plaintiffs shall re-file an unredacted copy of their October 1 letter-motion, with unredacted copies of Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2 attached, on the public docket. There is no need to refile Exhibit 3, which already appears on the public docket, in redacted form, at Dkt. No. 65-1.

The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to close the letter-motions at Dkt. Nos. 54, 56, 61 and 63 in Case No. 21-CV-614 and the letter-motions at Dkt. Nos. 30 and 32 in Case No. 21-CV-1141.

Dated: New York, New York
October 19, 2021

SO ORDERED.



BARBARA MOSES
United States Magistrate Judge

² Plaintiffs previously filed nearly identical letter-motions, addressed to Judge Schofield, at Dkt. Nos. 54 and 56 in Case No. 21-CV-614 and at Dkt. Nos. 30 and 32 in Case No. 21-CV-1141. Those motions are now moot.